

REMARKS**I. Office Action Summary**

Claims 12-17 are pending. Claim 12 is the independent claim. In the non-final Office Action mailed June 27, 2005, the Examiner stated that the previous rejections were moot in view of new grounds of rejection. The Examiner rejected claims 12-14 as obvious over the combination of Gifford (U.S. 5,812,776) and Bayless et al. (U.S. 5,754,636) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 15-17 were rejected as obvious over the combination of Gifford, Bayless et al. and Parzych (U.S. 6,115,384).

II. Rejections of Under 35 U.S.C § 103**A. Rejection of claims 12-14.**

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 12-14 over the combination of Gifford and Bayless et al.

CLAIM 12

Claim 12 relates to a method of obtaining information about a called party at a calling party device, where the method includes the steps of:

entering a telephone number for the called party at the calling party device;

receiving at the calling party device an address for locating a customized file of the called party;

retrieving the customized file at the calling party device using the address received; and

communicating from the calling party device with the called party over a voice channel associated with the telephone number.

In the pending claim, the calling party device receives an address for a customized file of the called party and then retrieves the customized file. The cited portions of Gifford strictly disclose a browser that simplifies access to

websites by allowing a user to enter the telephone number or other identifier so that “merchants do not need to alter their print or television advertising to provide an Internet specific form of contact information, and users do not need to learn about URLs.” (Gifford, Col. 8, lines 31-37). Gifford is focused on Internet browsing/shopping, is unrelated to voice telephone calls and, as noted by the Examiner, lacks any teaching or suggestion of voice channels or voice telephony.

Bayless et al. also fails to teach or suggest the combination of features of claim 12 or to make up for the deficiencies of the Gifford. Bayless et al. discloses a computer telephone system with the ability to manage multiple telephone lines and display caller ID information through a graphic user interface (See Col. 1, lines 35-47). The Examiner cites Bayless for the proposition that there can be communication over a voice channel associated with the telephone number (Office Action, p. 3). FIG. 41 of Bayless is cited by the Examiner and illustrates caller ID information formats (See Col. 28, lines 49-53). Bayless, while showing how a computer can be used to arrange a telephone call, does not teach any of the features of receiving at the calling party device an address for locating a customized file of the called party or of retrieving the customized file at the calling party device using the address received. Bayless et al. is concerned with managing calls through a graphic user interface that can display caller ID and is unconcerned with called party customized files.

Finally, there is no teaching or suggestion to combine the disparate teachings of Gifford and Bayless et al. Gifford’s disclosure of standard browser operations where a telephone number, rather than a URL, can be remembered to access a website does not suggest that the user would also like to call the telephone number or suggest any reason for wanting to add voice communications. Bayless et al. does not teach or suggest the steps of, or desirability of, receiving an address of a customized file of a called party or retrieving that customized file. Instead, Bayless et al. discloses a multifunction graphic user interface for handling multiple telephone calls. The Examiner’s unsupported statement that “it would be obvious” to modify Gifford to include the separate teachings of Bayless et al. is simply impermissible hindsight. Claims

13-14 are dependent claims, therefore their allowability directly follows from the allowability of independent claim 12. Reconsideration is respectfully solicited.

B. Rejection of claims 15-17.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 15-17 over the combination of Gifford, Bayless et al. and Parzych. Claims 15-17 are dependent claims, therefore Applicant submits that these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as provided for independent claim 12.

CLAIM 15

In addition to the reasons for patentability provided for claim 12 above, claim 15 includes the feature of the calling party device comprising a mobile phone having a data display. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that neither Gifford nor Bayless et al. teach or suggest the method using a mobile telephone. Applicant notes that Parzych also lacks any teaching or suggestion of a mobile telephone as the calling party device. The passage cited by the Examiner (Col. 6, lines 30-35) discloses a laptop computer with TCP/IP software and a wireless data modem – not a mobile telephone with a data display. Applicant also refers to its previous rebuttal of the Examiner's earlier assumption that Internet capable mobile phones were obvious in 1997. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 15 is allowable over the cited references for at least these additional reasons. Claims 16-17 depend from claim 15 and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed for claims 12 and 15. Reconsideration is respectfully solicited.

III. Conclusion

With the above, Applicant submits that claims 12-17 are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Kent E. Genin
Registration No. 37,834
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200